

REMARKS

Response to Restriction Requirement

In the Official Action mailed May 25, 2004, a restriction requirement was entered requiring Applicants to elect a single invention from the following groups of claims:

Group I Claims 1-6, 10-14, and 18-34;

Group II Claims 8, 9, 16, and 17.

In response to this restriction requirement, Applicants elect to prosecute Group I, Claims 1-6, 10-14, and 18-34.

Additionally, the Examiner is also requiring an election of species requirement between Specie I, a method of detecting, and Specie II, a method of treating inflammation. In response, Applicants hereby elect Specie I, a method of detecting. Claims 1-6, 10-14, and 27-34 (of Group I) read on Specie I, a method of detecting.

The PTO has also imposed an election of species requirement for secreted determinants found in, for example, Claim 1(c), and for compounds found in, for example, Claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants hereby elect the species TNF- α of Claims 1, 10, and 27. Further, Applicants hereby elect molecule in Claims 4, 13, and 28.

Support For Amendment To The Specification

As will be appreciated from the entire disclosure of the present application, the amendments entered into the specification simply correct typographical errors by replacing "effect" with "affect". Support for the amendments to paragraphs A1-A3 provided herein is found at page 10, lines 15-17 of the application as filed, and elsewhere throughout the specification, therefore no new matter has been added to this application. The specification at page 10, lines 15-17, indicates that the compounds or composition identified by the methods of this application may have a stimulating effect, an inhibitory effect, a stabilizing effect, or no effect at all. Accordingly, it is clear that they "affect" inflammation, glycated protein accumulation, and so forth.

Support For Amendment To The Claims

The amendments entered into Claims 10, 16, 18, 23, and 27 also simply correct typographical errors by replacing “effect” with “affect”. Support for the amendments to the claims are also found throughout the specification, including at page 10, lines 15-17 of the application as filed, therefore no new matter has been added to this application. The specification at page 10, lines 15-17, indicates that the compounds or composition identified by the methods of this application may have a stimulating effect, an inhibitory effect, a stabilizing effect, or no effect at all. Accordingly, it is clear that they “affect” inflammation, glycated protein accumulation, and so forth.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete Response to the Restriction Requirement mailed May 25, 2004. Early and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes any informalities remain in the application that can be resolved by telephone interview, a telephone call to the undersigned attorney is requested.

No fees are believed due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 09-0528.

Respectfully submitted,



David E. Wigley, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 52,362

WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC

P.O. Box 7037

Atlanta, GA 30357-0037

(404) 879-2435 (Telephone)

(404) 879-2935 (Facsimile)

(404) 872-7000 (Firm)

Our Docket No. R18631 1030.1 (51880.0006.2)

Client Ref. No. 18631-0121